

II

PERMANENT ISSUES OF THE PEACE

LAST night, you will remember, I attempted to analyze the causes which lay at the back of the Great War. I discussed the conditions which existed and the economic changes which had led to those conditions, and I concluded that what we had to deal with in the early years of this century was a Europe in which the civilization had become, on its economic side, top-heavy, and, as the result, unstable; and that it so happened that there was in Germany a strongly developed national militarism. These circumstances, working together, appeared to have prevented a sane solution of the difficulties by which the world was faced, and led to the catastrophe, to the suffering, to the slaughter that we all know too much about that occurred in the years 1914 to 1918. At the end of the lecture last night a number of you very kindly came and spoke to me about what I had said, and asked me what there was to be done to remedy the situation which existed as a result of the war and of all that had gone before it.

Now, last night, and to-night, I am engaged in lecturing, not making speeches. I have no panacea to suggest. I do not believe there is a panacea. If I were trying to sway you to get you to vote in a certain direction, I might recommend something to you as a panacea, but I have no interest in how you vote if you have anything to vote about at the moment. All I am interested in is to see that, if possible, this world moves out of the old ruts which led to war and

to catastrophe, and that it starts off in some way on a new road which, if we are right, will not lead to what the old roads led to. And so, rather than present you with a panacea, I ask you to join with me in thinking over the causes of the last Great War, and seeing if from them we can draw any lesson with regard to the future; and not only do I ask you to join with me in thinking over the causes of the Great War, but also to join with me in thinking of the effects of the Great War, the economic effects which every one of us is conscious of, which practically every one of us feels in his own pocket. And for the purpose of keeping our discussion in order I wish to take, first of all, the international steps that have to be taken, or that are being taken, to do what can be done through international action to relieve the conditions created by the Great War; then, in so far as it is possible at a meeting such as this to discuss national subjects, to take the national steps that should be taken to relieve the conditions created by the war. And then to turn to the international steps that might be taken to make another war less probable; and, finally, the national and the individual steps which might be taken with benefit to secure a movement in a similar direction. So that what I have to say to-night falls into four sharply defined classes, under four distinct heads.

First, the international steps necessary to remedy the conditions produced by the war, so far as they can be remedied by such action. Next the national steps for remedying the conditions already produced; next the international and, finally, the national steps that might be taken to make future wars less probable.

Now, with regard to the international steps that can be taken to remedy the conditions existing, to remedy the

conditions produced by the war that has passed, these are comparatively few.

The first, the greatest, the most difficult, has been the question of the reparation that the defeated countries can and should pay to the victors. That is a matter which, as you all know, has been under discussion for months. It has proved to be a subject of the most extraordinary difficulty because no two experts and no two bodies of experts have been found to agree as to what was the amount of reparation that could be paid. We have drifted along discussing, putting forward demands until now; and I wish to take this, the first public opportunity that I have had of saying—and I know I can speak in this not only for my own country but for all the European Allies—how much we appreciate the action taken by your President and your Secretary of State in connection with recent discussions. Not only do we appreciate it, but we welcome with the greatest joy the announcement that the United States is once again to take its place at the conference table at which the Allies sit. We are glad to learn that Colonel George Harvey, the American Ambassador in London, is to represent the President at the Supreme Council of the Allies. We are glad to learn that the American Ambassador in Paris is to take his seat, the seat that has been vacant for many months, at the Ambassadors' Conference in Paris, and that Mr. Boyden is to take, in a non-official capacity, his seat, which has also been vacant for many months, at the Reparations Commission; and there, by the action of your Government, so far as human understanding can reach, we have completed the set of conditions which are necessary to make the reparations question soluble, namely, that all the allied and associated Powers should once again sit as they sat during the war around the conference table and take part in the dis-

cussions, and take part in arriving at the decisions as to what is possible and what is impossible. That is now achieved. A few weeks ago it looked as if it were almost impossible to hope that such a state of affairs could again recur. Fortunately it has been brought about by the action of your President, and we may now regard the reparations question as placed in such a state that it is on the high road to satisfactory solution in every respect. Outside that, in international action, we have the question of the sovereignties over and the question of the status of the ex-German, extra-European territories. As you all know, there are certain minor difficulties remaining in connection with the settlement of those matters. I think on such an occasion as this there is nothing to be said except this, that I believe confidently that there is no doubt that those questions will be settled with the greatest possible ease. There were certain misunderstandings, because the position and the status of some of the governments had not been clearly defined, but that now is past, and we foresee no difficulties there. Now if we can get the reparations question settled, if we can have the question of the sovereignties of the ex-German, extra-European territories settled, we will begin again to move into the atmosphere of a world technically at peace, and that will be a great advance. At present, as you know, the world is not technically all at peace. Difficulties arise as a result of that, difficulties which increase the burden of the economic disturbances created by the war, difficulties which we now hope will fade away.

I told you that the second head to which I should refer was the question of the national action with regard to the restoration of the economic position of the world. It would be an impertinence on my part were I to attempt to suggest the action that you as a nation should take, but I

have no hesitation in saying what in my opinion is the action that my own country should take, and if you were to agree that your country should take similar action I should do nothing to contradict you. The first thing that my country has to do in order that the world may get back to a sound economic position is to lighten the government expenditure upon unprofitable business. It is impossible for my country to recover its economic position so long as the taxes bear so heavily upon industry, and so long as they withdraw from industry the money which might be going to the reestablishment, to the re-creation, to the expansion of the business of the country. All of us, I believe, all of us nations, if we speak for the moment as nations, who fought in the war, developed, during the war, a lax idea as to the meaning of "millions." It is extraordinary to hear an individual talk glibly in terms of hundreds of millions as if he understood in the least what he was talking about. I do not believe there is a single human mind that has any real picture of what a hundred million of anything is. I know I have not. Still we talk glibly of nations spending hundreds of millions or thousands of millions of their particular unit of currency. I am sure of this, we have got to get back, in my country, to a much stricter supervision over the objects upon which money is expended, and the unprofitable expenditures have to be cut out. That is fundamental with regard to the future of such a country as Great Britain. And you have got to remember in connection with this point that the taxes which my fellow-countrymen pay in the United Kingdom per head of population are, I believe, three times as heavy as the taxes which you and your fellow-countrymen are paying per head of population; and I know some of you think that your taxes are sufficiently heavy. You may imagine what some of my fellow-countrymen think. If you

can imagine what some of your fellow-countrymen say about paying taxes being multiplied by three, you will have an understanding of what some of my fellow-countrymen are saying; but that very fact, the need for the cutting down of expenditure, carries with it something of the most enormous importance from the point of view of peace. It does not matter to what country you turn. If you examine its national budget you will find that a very large proportion of the money it spends is being spent in preparation for future wars and for paying for past wars, and the only place where there can be a great cutting down of expenditure in most national budgets is in connection with the preparation for future wars. I shall return to this point in a moment; I ask you now to notice that the steps which can be taken in the international sphere, and the obvious great step which can be taken in the national sphere, to help us out of the conditions created by the war, are also helpful from the point of view of making world peace more easy, more certain of achievement in the future. To have the question of reparations settled and to have Germany realize that because she was unable to control her militarists she has got to pay to the limit of her ability, is an enormous step in the direction of discouraging other nations from allowing their militarists to get out of control. And believe me, if you look closely at the nations of the world you will be more lucky than I if you find one which has not got a militarist party in it, weak or strong. Some of them are quite weak, politically, some of them are strong, politically; but these militarist parties exist, in so far as I have been able to observe, in every nation of the world. Militarists—I use the word to cover navalists—people who are in favor of developments of armaments, more or less just because they want to have armaments, exist everywhere. Experi-

ence shows them to be a danger. I would ask you, too, to notice, still in the international sphere, that the action which can be taken to get us out of the slough of despond in which the nations are economically sunk is to establish sovereignty and settle questions of ownership; those settlements, too, if they be clear and distinct and suitable and guarded in a manner of which I shall speak in a moment, those, too, will be steps toward the establishment of a world organized for peace; and in the national sphere, if we can cut down expenditures in order that the internal conditions of the nations may be improved, and if the cutting of expenditures has the effect of limiting warlike preparations, that, too, will be a step in the direction of world peace.

And now, having passed in these twenty minutes in rapid review the steps which can be taken to lift us out of the difficulties created by the last war, let us turn and see what we can do with regard to preventing future wars, with regard, at all events, to making them less likely to occur.

I do not think that it would be wise for us to pretend to ourselves that there is any certainty that we can make war impossible, but let us at all events determine, if we can—and I am sure that no one who has seen war will hesitate to join in that determination—to make war less easy in its outbreak, less profitable to the victor.

In the old days there used to be many wars waged because of religious differences or for freedom to worship God according to the promptings of conscience. There is a fashion in wars as in clothes, because people's minds get concentrated upon a certain subject. In the centuries that have passed minds were concentrated very often upon minor religious differences, and we had the sequence of religious wars which racked the world. But now men's minds are

concentrated rather upon economic matters, the very pressure of population of which I spoke last night, the population that is, as I said before, the offspring of steam and steel and credit in industry, the very pressure of that population has increased the interest in the economic conditions of the nations. And if we look back at the causes of the Great War as we did last night, we see that at the back of the German mind, when it determined to use the sword to cut its way out of the difficulties, was a fear that the markets essential for the feeding of its populations would be closed to it. I wonder if you can think of any great experiment in open markets, open national markets? I can. The greatest experiment in open markets ever carried out that I know of has been the experiment made by the British Empire, scattered as it is on every continent, on islands in every sea. For the last fifty years so far as the central government of the empire has been concerned, the door has been held open for all trade, for all commerce—I do not speak of a self-governing dominion—so that there was no advantage in a British colony possessed by a British trader over an American trader, or German trader, or French trader. The whole policy of free trade which was characteristic of the central government of the British Empire for half a century has been a great experiment, and it has shown two things: first, that it holds a certain element of danger for the free-trade nation in a protectionist world; second, that it is an enormous safeguard against war in a world which is seeking trade. The danger in free-trade policy was this, that a protectionist nation with its trade highly organized and under the political direction of its government was able, by economic attack, to destroy certain industries vital to the activity of the free-trade nation in war. We had the experience, when the war broke out, that certain industries

which were vital to the nation in war, such as the fine chemical and the organic chemical industries, had been practically destroyed by the German economic attack on them, and it was with great difficulty that they were re-constituted during the war and made to produce those fine chemicals, those organic chemicals, those poison gases which the exigencies of the war demanded. There was that danger; but apart from that, the policy of free trade, when it came to the testing time of war, was seen to have had this effect: that between the component parts of the British Empire there had been no jealousy, there had been no occasion for internecine strife, and as a result those parts of the empire, the dominions, which really are to all intents and purposes, except that they owe allegiance to the British Crown, independent nations, because none had been favored and none disfavored, arose together to fight side by side with the old country and with her allies. There was no compulsion, no call, there was no need, for this reason, among others, that there had been no disagreement because of the freedom with which they had all traded throughout the colonial empire. And I believe that in that there is a great lesson for the whole of the nations of the world. As the economic side of international difficulty gains in importance it becomes more and more important that the territories under the control of any nation which lie outside its own capital territory—if I may use that phrase to mean the scattered territories under the dominion of any nation—that those territories should not be the exclusive economic preserve of the nation which is responsible for maintenance of order in them. In other words, I believe that one of the conditions essential to the preservation of peace in the future is this, that the great tropical possessions, the countries over which mandates have been given or are now being

given, should be, as the British Colonial territories were in the past, open freely to the traders, to the merchants of all nations upon equal terms; that is the old policy followed by Britain in regard to her colonial territories. Note again I am not speaking of the dominions which are self-governing, independent nations owing allegiance to the British Crown and not under control of the government in London; I am speaking of the territories which are under the control of the government in London, and with regard to them that policy of free trade, of equal opportunity, has been carried out consistently, with results which the war proved to have been, in the main, most satisfactory; and the greatest danger that I see in the future affecting the relations of nations is the conceivable possibility that some nation may try to establish a closed economic sphere either openly and without disguise or covertly and secretly. The second is much the more dangerous of the two; it is a matter which will require close attention from the statesmen of the world to prevent such a state of affairs arising.

I have taken this point first, because I believe that the ambition which some men in every manufacturing nation have more or less, the ambition to establish a closed economic sphere in which they shall have practically a monopoly of the markets, will seek to sway legislation. Strongly or weakly this ambition exists, and its existence is one of the great dangers to future peace.

The next point with regard to the future which requires international action is the question of disarmament, upon which I touched a moment ago when I spoke of the economic needs for the reduction in my country of the expenditure upon unprofitable government services. We saw last night how the existence of a great German army at a time of economic instability led that nation to decide to draw the

sword and to try to cut the Gordian knot through war, and as a result of that demonstration the victor nations of the world decided that Germany should be disarmed, and under the treaty of Versailles one of the most important series of clauses is that which deals with the disarmament of Germany. But Germany is not the only nation in the world; there are others, and the existence of great armaments and the existence or possible development of competition in armaments constitutes the second great danger to the future peace of the world.

I could imagine nothing more fatal than that your country or mine should become obsessed with navalist ideas. One has only to read some of the organs of your press, or, on the other hand, some organs of the British press, to see that there are people in both countries who would really be pleased if they thought there was to be a competition in building super-Dreadnoughts and super-Hoods between our nations.

It has been for many a long year a cardinal maxim with British people that they should tax themselves to produce, to equip, to man, and to maintain at sea a navy strong enough to protect against all comers the highways of their scattered empire. To no nation in the world is the sea so important as to Britain, but I have no hesitation whatever in saying that if your country believes it to be to your interest to maintain a fleet of equal power to that maintained by Britain, my fellow-countrymen are confident that they know you well enough to know the sort of use to which you will put your fleet, and they will not enter into any competition to try to get ahead. That is a most important declaration of belief with regard to the future relations between our countries. I know that my people, and I believe that the vast majority of your nation, would welcome

an arrangement between our countries which would divide the responsibility of policing the seas of the world between us, and which would provide for some simple arrangement for maintaining approximately equal naval strength. There is no good arguing about precisely equal strength, because no two experts will ever agree what that is. It should be sufficient in the first instance to agree that we shall maintain an approximate equality of strength, and if we had that agreement between us I think, I hope I am sure, that we would both find it an extraordinary saving in expenditure. I am not a believer in complete disarmament, either for you or for us. There are far too many people seeking to disturb the world for it to be safe, either for you or for us, to be completely disarmed and to be in the position of relying upon the good-will of some of the other peoples; but the idea that you and we should enter into naval competition as to who can build and maintain the strongest fleet seems to me to be lunacy of the first degree. And there is nothing after the maintenance of equal economic rights in the territories outside the capital territories of such importance to world peace, in my judgment, as to prevent the development of any sort of naval competition between you and us. Why should we ever dream of arming against each other? We have already a treaty between us which was ratified on the fifteenth of September, 1914, providing for a definite procedure to lead to the settlement of any questions which may arise between us and will not yield to the ordinary diplomatic procedure. I need hardly say that since that treaty was ratified no questions of the sort have arisen, but it is there, in reserve, as a safeguard, ratified by your Senate, ratified by my government, a treaty providing for delay if any question fails of diplomatic solution, for reference to an investigation commission in order that

all the aspects of the question may be ventilated, and I have never heard of any country after it had seen the other side's point of view, and after it had been face to face with the possible alternative of war for months, that did not decide that some sort of agreement and compromise was the better. And if there were no other reason why you and we should never fall out, we have that treaty, ratified most solemnly by the governments of both countries, providing for the most searching investigation into any dispute that might arise between us and be found not capable of diplomatic solution. The existence of that treaty seems to be ignored, forgotten by great numbers of people, but it is a vital factor in making it possible that the peace of the world should be maintained in the future. It is a factor between you and us, and there is no reason that I know of why a similar treaty should not be negotiated between any other pair of countries throughout the world; between you and any other country, between us and any other country, or between any pair of other countries. With such a process of investigation and delay provided for, we come to the third of the great international safeguards against the disturbance of the peace.

Let me recapitulate: first, the maintenance of the open economic sphere, or at all events the prevention of the creation of new closed economic spheres; second, the avoidance of naval rivalry between you and us, based upon some agreement with regard to the policing of the seas perhaps, but that is not necessary, based perhaps on equal annual expenditure with a view to securing approximate equality between our naval strengths; but even such an agreement as that may not prove to be absolutely essential; third, the negotiation and ratification of such treaties as that of the fifteenth of September, 1914, the Peace Commission

Treaty, establishing procedure for investigation and delay in the event of any dispute arising between your nation and mine, and the extension of such a principle to cover the nations of the world. Outside of these three conditions there are possibilities in connection with international courts, there are possibilities in connection with conferences, all of which are important, all of which exist now in embryo, and as the minds of the nations move toward understanding, will receive development, amplification, expansion, and extension. There we are dealing with the international aspects of the maintenance of peace.

But though I have devoted quite a large proportion of my time to the discussion of these international aspects of peace preservation, I do not believe them to be of paramount importance. They are important, but I believe there are other things much more important.

And, first, will you please cast back your mind to last night and remember what I said had been the result of the development of these great industrial populations, of men educated or partially educated driven from job to job, finding employment here and there, and as a result of the uncertainty of employment in any locality divorced from those ties which do most to sweeten life and to moor a man to his place in the living body of a nation. I believe that one of the greatest things for every nation, perhaps most of all for mine, is to tackle in its own way the problems of the industrial population. Here in this great, young state you have got the future before you, and your feet are hardly hampered, if hampered at all, by mistakes of the past. My country in the past has made mistakes in the handling of its industrial problems, mistakes which it will take many years to wipe out. In Britain you may see, and those of you who know Britain, who know the

manufacturing towns of our Midlands, will have seen there the slums, the wretched cottages which, in the face of low wages and uncertainty of employment, these men and women, the workers in the power factories, were alone able to afford. We have a long, difficult road to travel while we undo the mistakes of the early part of the industrial era. We have a long road to follow to clear out our slums, to reestablish proper conditions for the life of the working people. You have a chance of not making our mistakes. Learn by the mistakes we have made and remember that within the national life, not in the relation between the nations, lies the real spring of war. Nations do not go to war for fun. They go to war for fear. And a nation which has a large proportion of its population living in conditions unstable, uncertain, at best difficult and unpleasant, has a population which may suddenly be seized by fear. At any moment a situation may arise in which the workers can see nothing between themselves and hunger, the fathers nothing between their children and starvation, the mothers nothing between their babes and death, except the winning of a war; such an internal condition of instability which in sober fact exists in some of the countries of the world, and in some parts of other countries in the world, is one of the great difficulties which has to be met and dealt with and eradicated by those who seek to establish conditions satisfactory from the point of view of world peace. And you here, you citizens of Houston, here within your own city, within the districts which lie around your city, can, if you will see to it to-day, determine that so far as your district goes the conditions are to be satisfactory for the people, that there is satisfactory housing, not too monotonous, but in which there is beauty, for that is essential to the satisfaction of a people's mind. Ugliness, monotony,

bad design, poor material, hideous colors, those things you may think small and of light matter in connection with the maintenance of world peace. I used to, but I have studied this question as deeply as it is possible for me to plunge, and I am firmly convinced that the slum builder, the slum tolerator, and the man who likes hideous things perhaps because they are cheap, perhaps because he doesn't know how hideous they are, is just as great an enemy of world peace as any other that walks this earth. It is in connection with their own cities that the citizens can take the direct, practical lift with regard to establishing on a firm basis the peace of the world. It lies to your hand. The future is before you. What I have seen in Houston makes me realize that good work is being done. Do not let it be undone and do not let it dwindle. Rather seek to press forward. Do not let the slum builder set a foot within your city, and if he is there already, as fast as you can drive him out. And that leads me straight to the next big point in connection with world peace.

If you will examine the history of war you will find that time and time again the government of a state has plunged into war in the hope that on that road they would find escape from the dissatisfaction of their citizens. That was one of the reasons which made Germany plunge into the war in 1914, as I tried to explain to you last night; and you will find that wherever you have got mass dissatisfaction, based upon real conditions, you are dealing with the absence of something from the minds of the citizens of that country. You will find that you are dealing with an atrophied spirit of neighborliness between the people who are the more powerful and the more wealthy and the people who are the less powerful and the less wealthy. We have been through that in Britain. We used to have the

old relations between the lord of the land, the lord of the manor, the good lord of the manor, and his tenants, and his cottagers, not ideal perhaps in every way, but the human touch was there, and with the human touch extended by the more powerful and the more wealthy to the less powerful and the less wealthy, even to the powerless and the poor, there came a feeling of oneness, of friendship, of understanding, of loyalty that was an enormous asset to the country, and enabled the opinion of the country to be steadied at any time when it was inclined to become unsteady. With the development of the great industrial activity of the country that old touch was lost. The masters were new, unaccustomed to handling the poor, perhaps drawn from the ranks of the workers themselves, and as ever the man drawn from the ranks of the workers proved himself the hardest master. We got the lack of human touch between the employer and the employed. Perhaps some of you may know of some similar instances in this country. It is of enormous importance to the peace of the world that we should have the spirit of neighborliness between the powerful and the powerless, between the well to do and the badly to do. It may seem a small thing. But the more I ponder on the subject the more convinced I am that the factors which affect the home life of the nations are of profound importance from the point of view of world peace.

And with that there comes the question of education. I cannot to-night, in the few minutes that remain, enter into a discussion of what education should be, but I would ask you all to realize that education has nothing whatever to do with earning a living. It is not technical instruction. Education is a preparation of the mind, to carry great responsibilities and great burdens in the service of the

country, in the service of humanity. Apart from that altogether comes technical instruction, which equips a man or a woman to earn his or her living in some profession or occupation. But as I understand education, its object, its final goal, the only reason for it is to equip men and women to appreciate God and what the divine stands for in this life, to enable the individual to know himself and to understand his relations to the world in which he lives. And the fourth thing that education does is to make the individual understand the spirit of the age in which he lives; not necessarily sympathize with it, but understand it. It may be that the conscience of the individual will tell him that he has to fight to the death against the spirit of the age, and many a man has gone down fighting against it, fighting a fight that he believed to be right, and therefore, for him, was right. That is what education is. An education in that sense, an education which leads the individual to appreciate God—and there is far too little religion in most education to-day—that teaches the man, the woman to know himself, herself, to understand something of the relations surrounding her or him, and to understand the spirit of the age, is the education that you want to give to just as many of your children, your young people, as you can. Those people who have the benefit, who have the burden of that education laid upon them, may often wish that they had some lighter task imposed upon them in this life. To understand, to know, places the individual who understands and who knows beneath the yoke of service to a usually thankless people. He cannot do else but serve, for the nations must have educated servants who will understand and know and will lead them along the paths that lead to peace. Without education, in the real sense, and I brush aside all technical instruction, though through it education

may be got, there is no greater danger than the highly specialized, perfectly instructed on one subject, individual.

If you seek to work for world peace, you men and women of Texas, take the best advice that is available to you on the subject of education for your children, and let them have the education, the best education that you can afford to give them. As the world comes to contain more men and more women educated in the real sense, so will peace find more certain and more secure foundations. But outside that I believe that the real ultimate rock upon which the peace of the world will be based will be the democratic theory of government, one of the most difficult theories to understand, and, understanding it, to use it as a guide for your conduct. Democratic government is based upon the will of the people expressed through law, but it has behind it all a supposition, a supposition that the individual is free to do what he likes, to be what he likes, provided always that his doing and his being do not involve the creation of conditions which will prevent the free doing and being of reasonable people. The laws of the democratic state, as I understand democracy, have no reason to ape the laws of the theocratic state, in which the ruler is theoretically inspired from on high, perhaps by a tribal deity. In the democratic state law does not mark the division between good and bad conduct. It marks the division between conduct that is bad and conduct that is so bad that the people cannot tolerate it because it is a danger to the life of the state. It is easy to have too many crimes; and one of the great dangers that democracy is faced by, and as a result of democracy being faced by it the future peace of the world is faced by, is the creation of too many crimes, the forgetting that the essence of democracy is individual freedom, limited only by this dictum of society, "If you do that

which prevents the reasonable exercise of liberty by your fellows, if you do that which offends against the life and the property of your fellows, you shall be punished; you shall for the time being be removed from the exercise of liberty in order that you may learn the value of liberty." That is the theory of democracy as I understand it. And if, through over-legislation, a danger present in all democratic countries, we were to get a reaction against the democratic form of government, then the peace of the world might well be despaired of, because apart from democracy you only have a choice between some of the forms of oligarchy, absolutism, or dictatorship. The most essential condition of world peace is that democracy should flourish and grow strong and should not weaken itself by copying theocracy, which is its antithesis. Yet in many countries democracy seems to be taking it for its model and is trying to make men good and happy by law. This is a great danger.

I am almost finished. I told you last night that I was going to speak of the conditions of world peace, namely, to speak of those things which we have to work for in order that world peace may be more probable and war less likely, and I want in drawing to a conclusion to ask you to think quickly: what do you mean by the word "peace"? Do you mean the absence of war? Do you mean the absence of fighting? Is it a negative thing that you mean, or is it something positive? Have you thought? Peace, to me, is essentially positive. It is not the absence of anything. Peace is the presence, in the minds of men, of a joyful acceptance of the reign of law, and that means that when we have talked of all of the conditions of world peace, international, national, governmental, social, we look at what peace is, and we say, "Why, we have been talking of things

external," and that is what we have been doing. Peace is not outside us. Peace, world peace, must be within each of us. The joyful acceptance of the reign of law, that is peace; and the first and the last condition of the maintenance of world peace is that man should school himself gladly to accept and to obey law.

AUCKLAND GEDDES.